REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated October 6, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-11 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-11 are canceled. Claims 14-28 are added. As a result, claims 14-28 are pending for examination with claims 14, 19 and 24 being independent.

Initially, Applicant's point out that a Notice of Appeal was filed in this case on December 18, 2008, but no Appeal Brief has been filed to date. Rather than proceed with the Appeal, Applicant herein files a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with the above claim amendments and following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2004/0059575 (Brookes) in view of US Patent No. 6,061,646 (Martino). Claims 1-11 have been canceled and this rejection is now moot. As discussed above, new claims 14-23 have been added and are believed to patentably distinguish over Brookes and Martino, either alone or in combination, as discussed in further detail below.

A.   Discussion of Brookes

Brookes is directed to a multiple pass voice recognition method for use in car navigation systems so that directions may be given in a hands-free environment without requiring visual interaction of the driver with the car navigation system when commands are input to the navigation system ([0004]). In a first pass, a speech signal is parsed and initial speech recognition is performed ([0044]). In one or more further passes, portions of the recognized speech are further analyzed via a grammar to understand the speech in the context of navigation/directions (pages 6-8). However, Brookes is completely silent with respect to receiving speech information from a plurality of transmission channels, recognizing an in-use transmission channel and determining channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel. Because Brookes is silent in this respect, Brookes is also silent with respect to performing subsequent recognition based, at least in part, on the channel information.

B.   Discussion of Martino

Martino is directed to a kiosk that can respond to a natural language inquiry from a user in different languages (Column 1, lines 5-10). In Martino, the language spoken by the user is first recognized by counting the number of words in the natural language inquiry that match a small dictionary of common words in each of the lanaguages the kiosk is configured to recognize (Column 5, line 2- - column 7, line 22). Once the language has been identified, the natural language inquiry may be recognized using a recognizer adapted for the specific identified language (Columns 7-9). As with Brookes, Martino is completely silent with respect to receiving speech information from a plurality of transmission channels, recognizing an in-use transmission channel and determining channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel. Because Martino is silent in this respect, Martino is also silent with respect to performing subsequent recognition based, at least in part, on the channel information.

C.   Claims 14-18

Claim 14, as amended, recites:

A system for providing transcription of a conference between two or more individuals, the system comprising:
a plurality of reception stages to receive speech information over a respective plurality of transmission channels;
at least one processor adapted to implement:
a *channel recognizer coupled to the plurality of reception stages to receive speech information, the channel recognizer recognizing which of the plurality of reception stages is receiving speech information during a given time interval to identify an in-use channel of the plurality of transmission channels and to provide channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel*;
a feature vector extractor for extracting at least one feature vector from the speech information based, at least in part, on *the channel information*;
a segmentation recognizer for performing acoustic segmentation of the speech information to provide acoustic segmentation information indicating at least one segment identified in the speech information based, at least in part, on the *channel information* and the at least one feature vector, the acoustic segmentation information including a label for the at least one segment of the speech information indicating whether the at least one segment is associated with speech, a pause in speech or non-speech;

> a language recognizer for determining a language of the speech information based, at least in part, *on the channel information*, the at least one feature vector and the acoustic segmentation information; and
> speech recognizer for providing text information corresponding to words recognized in the speech information based, at least in part, *on the channel information*, the at least one feature vector, the acoustic segmentation information and the language.

Nowhere does Brookes or Martino, alone or in any combination, disclose or suggest a plurality of reception stages to receive speech information over a respective plurality of transmission channels and "a channel recognizer coupled to the plurality of reception stages to receive speech information, the channel recognizer recognizing which of the plurality of reception stages is receiving speech information during a given time interval to identify an in-use channel of the plurality of transmission channels and to provide channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel," as recited in claim 14. As a result, the combination does not disclose or suggest any of "extracting at least one feature vector from the speech information," "performing acoustic segmentation," "determining a language of the speech information," or "providing text information corresponding to words recognized in the speech information," wherein said limitations are "based, at least in part, on the channel information," as further recited in claim 14 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the combination and is in allowable condition.

Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

D.   <u>Claims 19-28</u>

Claim 19 recites a method and claim 24 recites a computer readable storage device having a plurality of instructions that, when executed, perform the method. The method comprises:

> receiving speech information over a plurality of transmission channels;
> *recognizing which of the plurality of the plurality of transmissions channels is receiving speech information during a given time interval to identify an in-use channel of the plurality of transmission channels;*
> *providing channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel;*
> extracting at least one feature vector from the speech information based, at least in part, on the *channel information;*

performing acoustic segmentation of the speech information to provide acoustic segmentation information indicating at least one segment identified in the speech information based, at least in part, on the channel information and the at least one feature vector, the acoustic segmentation information including a label for the at least one segment of the speech information indicating whether the at least one segment is associated with speech, a pause in speech or non-speech;

determining a language of the speech information based, at least in part, on the *channel information,* the at least one feature vector and the acoustic segmentation information; and

providing text information corresponding to words recognized in the speech information based, at least in part, on the *channel information,* the at least one feature vector, the acoustic segmentation information and the language of the speech information.

Nowhere does Brookes or Martino, alone or in any combination, disclose or suggest a receiving speech information over a plurality of transmission channels, "recognizing which of the plurality of the plurality of transmissions channels is receiving speech information during a given time interval to identify an in-use channel of the plurality of transmission channels" and "providing channel information including at least one transmission parameter of the in-use channel," as recited in claims 19 and 24. As a result, the combination does not disclose or suggest any of "extracting at least one feature vector from the speech information," "performing acoustic segmentation," "determining a language of the speech information," or "providing text information corresponding to words recognized in the speech information," wherein said limitations are "based, at least in part, on *the channel information,*" as further recited in claims 19 and 24 (Emphasis added). Therefore, claims 19 and 24 patentably distinguishes over the combination and are in allowable condition.

Claims 20-23 and 25-28 depend from claims 19 and 24, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, for the sake of brevity, Applicant believes that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of the dependent claims. However, Applicant reserves the right to specifically address the further patentability of the dependent claims in the future.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: March 18, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Richard F. Giunta
Registration No.: 36,149
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000